



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,453	12/04/2003	Loyd E. East JR.	2003-IP-011867U1	7134
7590	01/17/2006			
Robert A. Kent Halliburton Energy Services 2600 S. 2nd Street Duncan, OK 73536-0440				
EXAMINER SMITH, MATTHEW J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3672				

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,453

Applicant(s)

EAST ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Smith

Art Unit

3672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6-8, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Montgomery et al. (6024171).

Montgomery et al. disclose producing gas from a coal seam comprising: drilling a vertical well 12 that intersects a seam 18; bi-wing fracturing the seam ("opposing ... perforations" 38, 40; col. 5, line 28) below the fracture pressure, via cavitation (col. 4, lines 46-47), along a plane of maximum stress (col. 4, lines 65-68); and eroding the seam via a hydrajert 34a, 34b.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery et al. in view of Surjaatmadja (5765642).

Montgomery et al. disclose producing gas from a coal seam comprising: drilling a vertical well 12 that intersects a seam 18; bi-wing fracturing the seam ("opposing ... perforations" 38, 40; col. 5, line 28) below the fracture pressure, via cavitation (col. 4, lines 46-47), along a plane of maximum stress (col. 4, lines 65-68); and eroding the seam via a hydrajets 34a, 34b but not casing, drilling at least one horizontal well bore into the coal seam, or fracturing the coal seam along the horizontal well bore using a hydrajetting tool.

Surjaatmadja teaches using a hydrajetting tool 14 to perforate casing and drilling at least one horizontal well bore 46 into the coal seam.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Montgomery et al. method to include casing and perforate the casing, as taught by Surjaatmadja, in order to complete the well and for maintaining stability in the area of the coal seam.

It would have been further obvious to provide casing in a horizontal well bore and perforate the horizontal casing with the hydrajetting tool since it is well known to complete horizontal well bores with casing and subsequently perforate the horizontal casing in order to produce the well along a longer interval.

Claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery et al. in view of Zupanick (6280000).

Montgomery et al. disclose producing gas from a coal seam comprising: drilling a vertical well 12 that intersects a seam 18; bi-wing fracturing the seam ("opposing ... perforations" 38, 40; col. 5, line 28) below the fracture pressure, via cavitation (col. 4, lines 46-47), along a plane of maximum stress (col. 4, lines 65-68); and eroding the seam via a hydrajete 34a, 34b but not removing water, or logging the well bore.

Zupanick presents removing water (col. 1, line 51) and logging (col. 1, line 60) a coal seam 12 in a horizontal well bore.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to remove water and log the Montgomery et al. hydrajettted well, as presented by Zupanick, in order to drain the coal seam (Zupanick, col. 1, line 63) and identify the coal seam (Zupanick, col. 1, line 60).

Claims 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montgomery et al. in view of Surjaatmadja and Zupanick.

Montgomery et al. disclose producing gas from a coal seam comprising: drilling a vertical well 12 that intersects a seam 18; bi-wing fracturing the seam ("opposing ... perforations" 38, 40; col. 5, line 28) below the fracture pressure, via cavitation (col. 4, lines 46-47), along a plane of maximum stress (col. 4, lines 65-68); and eroding via a hydrajete 34a, 34b but not casing, drilling at least one horizontal well bore into the coal seam, or fracturing the coal seam along the horizontal well bore using a hydrajetting tool.

Art Unit: 3672

Surjaatmadja teaches using a hydrajetting tool 14 to perforate casing and drilling at least one horizontal well bore 46 into the coal seam.

Zupanick presents removing water (col. 1, line 51) and logging (col. 1, line 60) a coal seam 12 in a horizontal well bore.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Montgomery et al. method to include casing and perforate the casing, as taught by Surjaatmadja, in order to complete the well for maintaining stability in the area of the coal seam plus to remove water and log the Montgomery et al. hydrajetted well, as presented by Zupanick, in order to drain the coal seam (Zupanick, col. 1, line 63) and identify the coal seam (Zupanick, col. 1, line 60), respectively.

It would have been further obvious to provide casing in the horizontal well bore and perforate the casing with the hydrajetting tool since it is well known to complete horizontal well bores with casing and subsequently perforate the horizontal casing in order to produce the well along a longer interval.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 16 November 2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new rejection is made in view of Montgomery et al.

While Montgomery et al. does not specifically state the pressure is below the formation fracturing pressure, the examiner contends the discussion of cavitation is sufficient evidence for anticipating the claims. Cavitation relies on the natural fissures and pressure inherent in a formation. To fracture a formation would not take advantage of this phenomenon. Thus, the pressure to encourage cavitation would have to be less than the fracture pressure. Also, Montgomery discusses fracturing as an alternative completion method, thus reinforcing the idea that the pressure to propagate cavitation is below the fracturing pressure.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3672

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-7034. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F, 9-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Bagnell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3672

MJS *MJS*
10 January 2006